

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **REMARKS**

Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being "anticipated by" the Slayton et al reference while all of the remaining claims have been allowed. The rejection of claim 19 is respectfully traversed although claim 19 has been amended to clarify the recitation therein with respect to the relationship between the acoustic propagation axis of the bi-plane transducer and the longitudinal axis of the probe.

In the rejection of claim 19, it is contended that "Slayton et al teaches all the recited components of a catheter-tip-mounted common footprint cross-array except that it does not specifically state that the acoustic axis is 'linearly arranged with respect to the longitudinal axis of the probe'." It is then contended that the "ordinary meaning of 'linearly arranged' is 'arranged along a line' without further specificity as to the orientation of the line hence all acoustic axes are 'linearly arranged' with respect to liens of reference."

While applicant does not necessarily agree with the contentions of the Examiner here, claim 19 has been amended to recite that the bi-plane transducer is mounted "so that the acoustic propagation axis thereof is co-linear with the longitudinal axis of the probe" rather than being "linearly arranged with respect to the longitudinal axis of the probe." As pointed out in the last response, claim 19 is directed to an ultrasonic bi-plane imaging probe wherein the acoustic axis of the transducer is aligned with the longitudinal axis of the probe. As is apparently acknowledged by the Examiner, this feature is simply not disclosed in the Slayton et al patent and, with the clarification that has been provided in claim 19 with respect to the two axes in question being co-linear, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19 is now clearly patentable over the Slayton et al reference.

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this application in condition for allowance by amending the only rejected claim to use language that addresses the issue raised by the Examiner regarding the previous claim language on which reliance was placed in distinguishing over the Slayton et al reference. Thus, if the Examiner finds that a problem still remains with this language, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned so that the problem can be overcome.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

**END REMARKS**